DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 049 HE 011 065

AUTHOR Stepsis, Robert
TITLE The Emperor's Clothes: The Politics and Process of Academic Program Review.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; College Programs; Data Bases; *Departments; *Educational Accountability; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Institutional Research; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Institutional Evaluation; *Institutional Self Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Justifications for academic program review include a need for external accountability, administrative decision-making, and a definition of purpose. An overall coordinating group that will monitor the review, set policy, and bring together all of the diverse operations is needed. Guidelines and standards for the review procedure need to be articulated in order to achieve some comparability between the reviews. The most important condition is a clear statement of the purpose and goals of the review. Working out the initial details of procedure, such as the time span of the review process and the unit to be assessed, is discussed. The stages of the actual review process include establishing a data base for the department, preparation by the department of a self-study of its activities and programs, and evaluation of each department by committees of faculty peers. Followup on the department self-study and evaluation by an internal committee from the perspective of local priorities and expectations is proposed. Issues of closure and confidentiality and the possibility of using a summary statement of reviewer's assessments and recommendations are discussed. Appendices outline information and procedures for establishing a data base and conducting a departmental self-study, internal review, and external review. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE EMPEROR'S CLOTHES

THE POLITICS AND PROCESS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Stepsis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Robert Stepsis
Department of English
Saint Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri 63103

ED167049

One of the results of the changing environment of post-secondary education has been a rapid acceleration of interest in academic program review. Although the drive to formalize a process of academic assessment is separate, in most institutions, from the pressure to collect and organize management information, to quantify the performance of an academic unit, nevertheless the attempt to systematize a procedure for evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of academic programs grows out of the same need to explain and justify what we do in our colleges and universities.

It is perhaps predictable that these attempts to organize procedures for academic program review have met with a mixture of hostility and scepticisim from many faculty members. Review programs that are poorly organized, have vague and contradictory goals, or confuse the expectations of undergraduate education with graduate training are bound to be seen as simply further bureaucratic tangles designed to increase the consumption of time and paper. Even more telling, however, is the preception that an academic review program, mandated and organized by the administration, is a serious infringement on what has been considered the faculty's major preserve--the control and management of the curriculum. This is not an unfounded fear; for review programs are in many cases the products of pressures on the

HE011 065

academy to which administrators, especially academic administrators, must respond.

Indeed, academic review programs which have come into vogue in the 1970's have become a lightening rod for many of the current tensions in higher education. On one hand, the impulse for organized and formal evaluations of departments and programs comes from outside the campus. The decision to assess the effectiveness of each academic unit is generally a response to a need for educational accountability, constricted budgets, and skepticism about the value of higher education in the seventies. For public institutions, legislatures and state education agencies want to limit the growth of redundant programs and find a way to judge the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the programs they support. For private institutions, boards of trustees want to know how to measure the impact of the limited resources they have to manage. For both, program review can be a way to rationalize decisions about priorities and directions.

On another level, the pressure for a comprehensive review system comes from the campus administration. Here again the need is not only to measure the effectiveness of the academic units, but also to determine campus priorities, to justify resource allocations and, with constricted budgets, to maintain strong departments or eliminate weak ones. While any competent academic administrator probably already knows which are the weak units on the campus, a review program can provide the support and leverage needed to make difficult decisions.

Finally, the social and intellectual climate of the times leads to a revaluation of education. What is the need and justification for specific disciplines, for graduate training in a particular field? What is the

purpose and function of undergraduate education? What are the goals of a university, or of liberal learning? Although an academic review may not answer these questions directly, the attempt to define the institutional mission or the future role of a particular department can begin with an evaluation program.

The point is that these justifications for program review--external accountability, administrative decision making, definition of purpose--all call into question the assumed competence, standards, and jobs of the faculty. Like the administrators, most faculty members "know" which programs and departments at their institutions, and even at neighboring ones, are strong and effective and which ones are of marginal educational quality. But now, with the possibility of a formal review program, they are being asked not only to verify and improve their work, but also to justify their very existence.

It is difficult for a faculty member to resist completely the idea of an organized program review. As an instrument of critical self-evaluation, it has an inescapable role in the university. However, the faculty can be defensive about the implicit threats to its authority, competence, and security in a review program. This defensiveness can take the form of disputes with the central administration over who has the final, controlling authority in the review procedure. At stake is the issue of separation of power in campus governance or the attempt to differentiate program evaluation from the administrative process of resource allocation. Also, there may be a reluctance to write specific guidelines for the review program or provide common instructions for the review committees on the grounds that academic standards in a discipline are obvious and known, that there is no

need to instruct a faculty committee on what to evaluate, and that a straight-jacket approach would produce a leveling and homogeneity among departments. Finally, there may be a tendency to allow reviews of undergraduate programs to proceed separately from a process of graduate program review, since there are such obvious differences of purpose and approach between the two.

Principles

In light of the many complex problems that a review program presents for a campus, it is imperative to establish some principles which should underlie any attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of academic units.

The first is that debates between the faculty and administration over who controls the review program simply vitiate the process. Academic program review is a common interest of the administration and the faculty; the review procedure must reflect this shared responsibility and interest. Program effectiveness is a factor of both academic quality and resource allocation and it is unrealistic to separate them.

Another principle is that separate and uncoordinated reviews of different aspects of the same academic unit will produce duplication, frustration, and contradictory results. Whatever decisions are made about how the reviews should be conducted (see below), there needs to be some overall coordinating group that will monitor the reviews, set policy, and bring together all of the diverse operations of academic program review. This Evaluation Coordinating Committee should reflect the shared faculty/administrative responsibility for program review and it should represent the most significant levels of authority from these groups in order to insure the seriousness and validity of the process.

Also, it is important, if the campus wants to achieve some compara-

bility between the reviews, for this Evaluation Coordinating Committee to provide guidelines and to articulate standards for the review procedure. Not only is it difficult to assume that everyone on campus, as well as people brought in from the outside, knows what the standards are and what it is that is being evaluated, but also a precise definition of areas of inquiry will save the people conducting the reviews from floundering around trying to define their purpose. The guidelines should leave room for the review committees to explore other issues and should be sensitive to departmental and disciplinary idiosyncrasies, but they must give shape and direction to the process.

Finally, the most imperative condition underlying a review program is a clear statement of the purposes and goals of the review. Some body, either the Coordinating Committee, the chief academic officers, or the faculty leadership, must articulate to the campus why the reviews are being conducted and what will be done as a result of the review process. Whether a comprehensive program of academic review has been forced on the institution by a suspicious State agency, or there is a need to retrench and shift resources, or to redefine the institutional mission, or whether it is simply an attempt at quality control, the purpose of the program should be clear from the beginning. It is difficult enough to secure the faculty's commitment to a review procedure that holds the threat of retrenchment or calls their competence into question; the program is impossible if significant campus elements perceive a hidden agenda in the process. There should be no preconceived plan to eliminate certain unpopular departments and no prior intent to use the review process to ratify administrative decisions that have already been made.

Preliminaries

Once the principles and purposes of the review program have been secured, the initial details of procedure can be worked out. Issues such as the composition of the Coordinating Committee, the time span of the review process, the unit level at which the evaluation will be conducted, and the aspects of the unit to be assessed are obvious but necessary preliminaries to be settled.

One crucial item is the membership of the Coordinating Committee set up to run the evaluation program. The Committee should reflect the governing style of the institution in its best moments. Faculty leadership (head of the Senate, chairs of curriculum and graduate committees) should be balanced by key academic administrators (graduate dean, several undergraduate deans) in order to reflect the principle of shared responsibility. Student representation should be weighed carefully and allocated in accordance with the campus pattern of student participation. It may be advisable to keep the institutional officer who has the final responsibility for academic decisions--the Provost or Academic Vice President--separate from this Coordinating Committee, so he/she will be free to act on the recommendations growing out of the evaluation process.

If the Coordinating Committee has established the purposes and aims of the review, these will help determine the framework of the procedure. For example, the timing of the process is dependent on the conditions impelling the review. If there are pressures to shift resources or reassess the mission of the institution, there may have to be a crash program in which all the academic units are reviewed over a span of one or two years. The kind of evaluation possible under these circumstances is very different from a more

stable pattern of program review in which units are evaluated periodically in a regular cycle. If only a predetermined fraction of units are to be reviewed each year, then the process can be designed so that the stages of the review are coordinated with the academic calendar. The review plan that I suggest below assumes that only a few departments will be evaluated each year and that the process can operate over the whole academic year.

Both the purpose of the review and the organization of the institution will determine the unit level of the evaluation. Most review programs focus on the academic departments. However, elements within the departments, such as interdisciplinary programs, the undergraduate major, or the graduate program are frequently the object of the review. If the aim of the program is to reassess institutional goals, the review can focus on specific degree programs (B.S., Ph.D.) or entire divisions, schools or colleges within the university. But whatever level of the organization is reviewed, it must again be the premise that all such units on the campus will be evaluated, not just those prejudged to be weak or in trouble. While it may be difficult to eliminate prejudgment from the process, it is important to subject all comparable units to the same evaluative test in order to insure the credibility of the program.

Another preliminary decision must be made with regard to what functions of the unit will be evaluated. The primary focus of an academic review program is the educational quality of the department, the effectiveness with which it performs its teaching, learning and research functions. However, in most institutions, the academic effectiveness of a department is conditioned by the full range of its activities and relationships. Thus, even though it will expand the time and effort needed to reach a conclusion, a comprehensive review program should include an evaluation of such things

as the administration and management of the unit, its financial status, the allocation of its resources, and its relationships with parallel units and with the college or campus administration. It is the function of the Coordinating Committee to insure that with such a full scale review, the evaluation groups do not get lost in financial or administrative details, but that the academic performance is seen in the context of all the activities that impact a department.

A more difficult decision concerning the focus of the review is whether it should include both the graduate and undergraduate programs of a department within the framework of a single evaluation. Most of the review procedures established to date have been set up to evaluate graduate degree programs, while little attention has been devoted to the formal assessment of undergraduate curricula, requirements, or majors. One reason for this is that most disciplines have developed a fairly clear set of criteria for measuring the quality of a graduate program. A review committee can look at the research and publications of the faculty, the admission and placement records of the students, and it can read dissertations. However, the use of these devices or the application of graduate standards to measure the effectiveness of undergraduate programs may seriously distort the usefulness of the review. In the absence of any agreed on criteria for evaluating the relative strengths of undergraduate studies, reviews have concentrated on the graduate degree and left undergraduate evaluation to surveys of student opinion about the teaching qualities of individual instructors.

Thus, the decision to assess a department in the full range of its activities and responsibilities will depend on the Coordinating Committee developing a set of guidelines that faithfully reflect the standards and goals of an institution's undergraduate program. However, the difficulties

of combining the reviews should not be minimized. One danger is that the professional criteria of graduate work will be confused with the expectations of the undergraduate curriculum and teaching. Another possibility is that the attempt to combine evaluations of programs that have different criteria will simply dilute the attention paid to the review of each. Time and energies will be so diffused that neither activity receives the in-depth attention it needs.

These difficulties may mean that the Coordinating Committee will have to appoint separate review groups for each level of a department's activities and be itself the integrating force in the review process. Or, if there is a single review group, it may have to allocate its membership between the two programs. But whatever the difficulties, the normal interrelationship of graduate and undergraduate education within a department makes it imperative that a way be found to correlate the evaluation of the two.

Process

With the preliminary details of timing, focus and level of review settled, the Coordinating Committee can establish the plan for the actual review procedure. The stages outlined below are intended to provide a successive analysis of a department that culminates in a final evaluative report, recommendations, and action.

The first step is to establish a data base for the department that can be used at all subsequent stages of the review. Since much of what takes place in the evaluation process is a factor of opinion and judgment, it is important to provide a stable foundation of facts that all parties can agree on. Most universities have an Institutional Research unit which can be assigned the task of gathering statistics on departmental workload, finances, student performance, and faculty effort over a specified period of years (see

Apendix A for a sample listing of data to be collected). In the absence of a centralized data unit, the job of providing the statistical base can be assigned to the department under review or to the Dean or Vice President's office. In any case, it should be a principle of the data gathering that it be a factual, non-evaluative summary of a department's activities over a span of time (usually five years) that is sufficient to minimize temporary statistical fluctuations.

Another report that can be included in this preliminary stage of the review is a performance audit of the department. If an institution has a business or administrative office capable of doing a performance audit of academic units, it would be a valuable additional step in the review process because a performance audit can contribute information on the efficiency of the organization and management of the department. Since performance audits are periodic administrative reviews that will be done whether there is an academic review or not, it makes sense to coordinate the two in the name of both efficiency and possible mutual enlightenment. If the business office is not set up to do performance audits of the academic units, it would probably be best to eliminate this step from the review process rather than go to the expense of bringing in outside auditors who may have little understanding about the functioning of academic departments.

With the data base , if possible, the performance audit in hand, the next step in the review process is for the department under review to prepare a self-study of its activities and programs. The purpose of the self-study is to engage the department in a serious assessment of itself and to provide a framework for others to judge the department's performance in the context of its own goals and priorities. In the long run, perhaps the most valuable part of the review process is this departmental revaluation of

its programs, its objectives and its effectiveness (see Apendix B for an outline of some of the areas to be considered in this study). While the report may be self-serving if the department feels threatened by the review, it can also be an opportunity for the faculty to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the department, the shape of the curriculum, and the relationship of undergraduate teaching to research and graduate training in the discipline. The self-study will also be a barometer for subsequent review groups to judge whether the department's objectives and priorities, as well as its performance, are consistent with the standards of the institution. To this end, the Coordinating Committee will have to set up a schedule for the review process, so that a department is aware that it is expected to complete the self-study in time for subsequent reviewers to make use of the report in their evaluations of the department.

Following the self-study is the heart of the review process: the evaluation of each department by committees of faculty peers. At issue in this stage of the process is whether these review groups should be composed of local faculty from related departments or of members of the discipline from outside the institution. The advantage of a faculty review committee from within the instituion is that an internal group will be more familiar with the actual operation and performance of a department on their campus. They will be able to do an in-depth review of the unit because they can spend the time studying the documents, interviewing students and faculty, and reporting realistically on all the dimensions of a department's activities. An internal committee will know the local standards as well as the intangible qualities of a department in a way that an external committee would never understand in a short and superficial visit to the campus. As a result, an internal committee will be able to judge such things as the department's spirit

and cohesiveness as well as its teaching effectiveness, rather than being confined to the quantifiable aspects of a department, such as the number of students processed or its research productivity, as an external committee would be.

The weaknesses of an internal review are precisely the strengths of an external committee. Since an internal group would have to be composed of members from departments other than the one under review, there would be no expertise or perspective from within the discipline itself. An external committee will know the national standards of the discipline and therefore be better able to judge the relative strengths and weaknesses of the department. Most importantly, an external committee will be free of local biases, friendships, and politics and will be able to render a more objective evaluation of the work being done by the department.

Obviously, the best review will combine the advantage of both systems. One alternative is to have a single committee composed of both internal and external reviewers. But the problems of logistics, of finding a way for a mixed committee to meet frequently enough to be effective, and of having a "rump" group of internal members meeting on their own make this a less than satisfactory solution. If an institution can afford both the time and the expense of two committees, one internal composed of members from relative departments and the other of distinguished members of the discipline from other campuses, the impact and effectiveness of the review will be enhanced.

The model proposed here is for an internal committee to follow up on the self-study and evaluate the department from the perspective of local priorities and expectations. They would conduct a student survey, investigate the impact of the department on other contiguous units, and report on their perceptions of the effectiveness of the department's programs and

curriculum. Only then is an external committee selected, given a copy of all the documents generated in the review process, and brought to the campus for a visit of several days. The charges to this committee would be to evaluate the department from the perspective of national and disciplinary standards, to study the coherence of the curriculum, and to report on the ability of the faculty to conduct both undergraduate and graduate programs in the field. In this model both committees are given specific guidelines as to the scope and purpose of the review, as well as directions for areas of inquiry (Appendices C and D). However, at this stage of the review process, it should be understood that the guidelines are only indications of the kinds of things an institution wants assessed and that the committees are free to evaluate the department as they best see fit.

Another variation on this format is to have the internal committee isolate problematic or doubtful aspects of the department's performance and then to have an external committee brought in to comment on these areas and offer recommendations for solutions. The danger of this format is that, if the internal committee can find no problems or weaknesses in the department, there might be a tendency to forego the healthy examination by an external group. Nevertheless, if monitored rigorously by the Coordinating Committee, this latter method can save some duplication of effort and some time in bringing the review process to a conclusion.

Closure

When the Coordinating Committee receives the reports of the internal and/or external review committees, it is faced with the interrelated problems of closure and confidentiality. The success and credibility of the evaluation process will depend a great deal on the precision and seriousness of the actions that follow the review.

The question of the confidentiality of the reports submitted by the review committees, as well as of any final report produced by the Coordinating group, must be addressed clearly in planning for the reviews and acted on consistently during the process. The advantage of asking that the reports of the internal/external reviewing committees be given and held in confidence is to encourage these reports to be frank assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the department. Also, since the reports will probably include evaluations of the department's faculty and staff there should be some measure of confidentiality to protect both the committee members and the departmental personnel from unnecessary embarrassment in the review process.

However, if the principle of openness and fairness is to be upheld throughout the review program, it is inconsistent to promote an air of secrecy at this final stage of the procedure. The whole process would be better served if the reports of the review committees are made available to anyone who has a need to know about them. If the reports are critical of specific people, it is to be hoped that the atmosphere of the campus and the professionalism of colleagues enable the institution to deal with that criticism in an open and frank way. Further, it is desirable in terms of the overall educative value of the review process to circulate the committee reports through the entire unit and to allow the department to provide a written response to the reports if it feels the need to clarify or comment on issues raised in the review.

On the other hand, if the Coordinating Committee decides that the campus is not ready for this degree of openness or that the lack of confidentiality will inhibit the frankness of the review committees, rather than close the review process to the campus at this point, they should be prepared to develop a comprehensive summary statement of the reviewer's

assessments and recommendations. The purpose of this summary is to inform the department of the results of the review and allow it to respond to the evaluation if it so chooses. The summary and the departmental response would then become the operative documents for any further action to be taken on the review.

It is impossible to detail what final actions should grow out of an academic program review of a department, except to say that, in order for the review process to be taken seriously, there must be some credible response by campus agencies to the time and effort expended on the evaluations. Again, the purposes and goals of the review will determine the appropriate response. At a minimum, there should be a meeting between the department head, the Coordinating Committee, and the chief academic officer to discuss the substance of the evaluation and to decide on any corrective actions. The chair should also discuss the evaluation with the department in order for any recommendations to be considered and implemented. At this point, it is the responsibility of the Dean or chief academic officer to insure that recommendations are carried out, that resources are provided, and that the department fulfills its obligations to the review.

There is, however, a more significant way that an institution can integrate the review process with the decisions and policies of the campus. The reports of the summary evaluation can also be transmitted to the major curricular and budgetary committees of the institution. In this way, the impact of an academic review program can be not only a test of departmental or institutional quality, but it can also be a step towards putting the decisions about faculty and money and courses into the context of an ongoing assessment of academic priorities and educational effectiveness.

APPENDIX A - DATA BASE

The following information will be compiled for each department under review. The information is to be arrayed for each of the last five years and given both in absolute numbers and in percentage of university total, where applicable.

a. Personnel.

1. Permanent Budgeted Faculty FTE.
2. Percent Tenured.
3. Actual Faculty head count.
4. Teaching Assistants (TA) FTE.
5. Post Doctoral Scholars.
6. Clerical, Technical, Administrative Staff.

b. Instructional Load.

1. Total Instructional Load: Student-Faculty ratio.
2. Instructional Load by level of instruction--lower division FTE, upper division FTE, Masters head count, Ph.D. head count.
3. Percent of total undergraduate workload devoted to upper division majors and to non-majors.
4. Ratio of upper division majors per Faculty FTE.
5. Ratio of Graduate Students per Faculty FTE for Masters, for Ph.D.'s.
6. Ratio of FTE students per TA FTE.
7. Ratio of Staff FTE per Faculty FTE.

c. Programs.

1. College programs for which the department is responsible or to which it supplies faculty. Faculty FTE's assigned to each program.
2. Course requirements for the undergraduate major.

3. Areas of the discipline in which Masters and Ph.D.'s are offered.

4. Course requirements for the Masters and Ph.D.

5. Number of Faculty FTE who participate in each disciplinary area.

d. Faculty.

1. Specialties or disciplinary areas in which the faculty member participates.

2. Curriculum vitae and bibliography.

3. Research grants (title, funding agency, grant period, amount).

4. Research now in progress.

5. Percentage of time devoted to undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching and supervision, research.

6. List of undergraduate courses taught in last five years.

7. List of graduate courses taught in last five years.

8. Number of graduate students under supervision.

9. List of dissertations directed or under direction by student and title.

e. Students.

1. Upper division majors.

2. Number of Graduate students (head count) enrolled in each disciplinary area.

3. Annual degrees granted--Bachelors, Masters, Ph.D.

4. Number of Graduate applications, number accepted, number rejected, and the number of those accepted who registered.

5. Median and range of GRE scores of students admitted to graduate program.

6. Schools from which admitted students received their undergraduate degrees.

7. Ratio of graduate students entering to those completing the program.

8. Percentage who pass preliminary examinations.

9. Percentage who complete dissertation.

10. Placement of Ph.D.'s by student and job.

f. Financial.

1. Library budget. Percentage of library budget spent.

2. Total support funds.

3. Instructional funds for graduate students--TA's Readerships, RA funding, University fellowships, Traineeships.

4. Total of contact and grant research awards.

5. Number of graduate students with national fellowships.

APPENDIX B - DEPARTMENTAL SELF-STUDY

The format of the self study is the responsibility of the department. However, the following items should be included.

1. Process used in formulating the self-study.

2. A statement of the goals of the department. What are the educational and/or career objectives of the department's undergraduate program for majors and for non-majors? What is the purpose of the graduate program and what are its distinctive features? What are the goals of its joint programs and its college programs? What research goals is the department committed to? What are the public service functions of the department?

3. Departmental organization, administrative and committee structure. Include a discussion of instructional work loads, distribution of graduate/undergraduate activity and lower/upper division teaching.

4. An analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the department. A description of any unique elements in the undergraduate or graduate programs; areas of excellence or of potential excellence, or areas of concern.

5. Relation of the undergraduate to the graduate program (e.g. the undergraduate base for the graduate program, relation of TA's to undergraduate instructional program,etc.).

6. The balance in the department between teaching programs for the colleges and the maintenance of the undergraduate major. The relation between the teaching of non-majors and majors.

7. The structure of the curriculum, including prerequisites, course sequences, requirements, and the adequacy of the faculty (number, breadth and training) for the college courses, the major and graduate programs.

8. The role of independent study, student research, joint student-faculty projects, fieldwork, internships, extension courses in both the undergraduate and graduate programs.

9. Student counselling, curricular and career advising, selection of research and dissertation topics, methods by which the department guides students to the fulfillment of their programs.

10. Adequacy of facilities, labs, office space, library resources, equipment and institutional support for the department's programs.

11. Future plans for changes in the department's programs, requirements or goals. The impact of steady state, temporary faculty, the department's tenure ratio and the possibility of reduced support on the department's planning objectives, its ability to provide programs for the colleges, to increase/decrease graduate enrollments or to meet changes in the development of the discipline.

12. Unique features of the department, extraordinary teaching, research or public service demands, unusual enrichment potentials from visiting professorships, federal support, etc., contract and grant administration, interdepartmental programs, general education teaching.

APPENDIX C - INTERNAL REVIEW

In concluding its review, the Internal Committee will first meet with the Coordinating Committee to obtain clarification of method and identification of any specific issues to be addressed by the committee. The internal faculty review committee will be encouraged to carry out personal interviews with departmental executive officers, provosts, faculty members in the department, undergraduate majors and graduate students. The following areas of inquiry are not meant to be prescriptive but to act as guidelines for the committee in the preparation of its report. The committee's assessment of the department's performance should be based on a realistic judgment of the standards of excellence in both undergraduate and graduate education required by the University.

a. The Department.

1. Does the department have a clear sense of its educational goals and objectives in regard to its college programs, its undergraduate major and its graduate program? Is there a perceived relationship between undergraduate and graduate education in the department? What is the effect of the undergraduate program on the graduate program and vice versa?

2. Is there strong leadership in the department?

3. Is the organization and committee structure in the department efficient? Is there sufficient participation of faculty and students in the major departmental decisions?

b. Undergraduate Programs.

1. Is the major program coherent and viable? Does it take into account the diverse objectives of the students?

2. Are the requirements and prerequisites of the curriculum adequate to the objectives of the major?

3. How well does the department meet the needs of the college programs? Is there adequate cooperation between the department and the Deans?

4. How well do the undergraduate programs meet the needs of other departments and programs on the campus? Is there sufficient rapport to provide support to other departments? Is there unnecessary duplication of courses with other departments?

5. Do students receive adequate information about courses, requirements, prerequisites, performance expectations, etc.?

6. Do students receive adequate counselling within the department? Is there sufficient opportunity for them to meet with faculty members outside the classroom? Do they receive adequate and timely criticism and commentary on their papers, reports and tests? Are there any specific faculty members whose performance in this regard harms the department's relationship with its students?

c. The Graduate Program.

1. Are the admission standards proper to maintain a quality graduate program?

2. Are the recruiting efforts sufficient to attract superior students from other universities?

3. Is the progress of each graduate student properly monitored? Are students evaluated and counselled in such a way that mediocre students are encouraged to leave the program?

4. Is the curriculum designed to give students adequate depth and breadth in the discipline?

5. Is course frequency sufficient to enable students to complete the program in a reasonable time?

6. Is the examination structure of the department, including qualifying and candidacy examinations, well planned and a fair and adequate test of a student's qualifications?

7. Does the faculty develop guidelines and definition of a dissertation? Does the student have to formulate a detailed dissertation proposal which is reviewed and evaluated by an advisory committee?

8. Are the retention, attrition and completion rates of the students within the normal bounds of graduate education in the discipline?

9. Is there an adequate job placement effort made on behalf of the students? Does the placement record support the goals and aims of the program?

10. Is the number of graduate students being trained proper in the light of faculty size, the mission of the University and societal and educational needs?

11. Is student aid support adequate? Are students given the opportunity to teach? Is the amount and level of service required of assistants reasonable?

d. The Faculty.

1. Is faculty morale good? Is the department unified?

2. Does the departmental evaluation of faculty members give adequate weight to both teaching and research accomplishments?

3. Is there evidence of faculty productivity, of national standing, of initiative in seeking support for research opoortunities, and of concern for undergraduate education?

4. Are a variety of interests within the field represented by the faculty?

e. Supports.

1. Are the library and equipment resources adequate for the degree programs and specialty areas?

2. Are the laboratories, offices and physical facilities of the department adequate?

3. Is there sufficient staff support for the department to carry out its programs effectively?

f. Are there any unique elements in the department which affect its level of support, its teaching or its research functions?

g. What are the areas of excellence and the areas of concern in the department?

h. Recommendations.

APPENDIX D - EXTERNAL REVIEW

The External Review committee will have its campus visit scheduled so that it begins with a discussion with the Coordinating Committee about the issues and procedures of the review. The Graduate and College Dean will arrange for the committee to meet with representative students involved in the department's programs. In addition, interviews will be arranged with the Dean, the department chairperson, and faculty members. The committee will be encouraged to read randomly selected dissertations written by graduates of the department, as well as some of the publications of faculty members. The review committee will select its own format and pursue any lines of inquiry it sees fit. The following will serve simply as guidelines for the committee's information. The standard of evaluation should be the department's performance in relation to the outstanding educational programs in this discipline in the country.

a. The Department.

1. Are the department's plans and objectives realistic? Are they consistent with a position of national leadership in the discipline? Do they take sufficient account of the growth and changes taking place in the discipline?

2. Is there evidence of strong leadership in the department?

3. Is there sufficient coherence in the department between its educational goals and the interests and capabilities of the faculty?

b. Undergraduate Programs.

1. Are the courses, requirements, sequences, prerequisites, etc. of the undergraduate major appropriate for a high quality program? Are they suitable to the educational objectives of the department?

2. Does the program lead to a broad, well-integrated knowledge of the discipline?

3. Are the senior faculty adequately involved in the undergraduate major?

4. Are the students enthusiastic, perceptive and knowledgeable about the program and the discipline?

5. Do the lower division, general education, core-curricular courses adequately reflect the department's commitment to undergraduate education?

6. Is there sufficient flexibility in the curriculum and in the course requirements to allow non-majors to profit from courses in the discipline?

c. The Graduate Program.

1. Are the courses, requirements, sequences, prerequisites, etc. appropriate for a high quality program? Are they suitable to the educational objectives of the department?

2. Do the course offerings and degree requirements reflect current developments in the field? Is the program up to date?

3. Is the breadth of coverage well provided for by the faculty and other resources available? Is there sufficient support for this program by other related ones at the institution?

4. Is institutional support committed firmly enough for the program to continue at high quality? Is it likely that adequate support will continue to be available from external sources?

5. What is the caliber of faculty research and publication? How important to the field is the work being done?

6. Is there an adequate supply of qualified graduate students? Are the admission criteria well defined and strictly administered?

7. What appears to be the caliber of the present graduate students? Are they enthusiastic, perceptive and knowledgeable about the program and the discipline?

8. Is the progress of students toward their degrees satisfactory? Are the retention, completion and attrition rates proper and acceptable?

9. What is the quality of the predoctoral examinations? Is there an adequate procedure to guide and assist a student in the definition of a dissertation topic? What is the caliber of dissertations (by area)?

10. Are students provided with enough supervised teaching experience? Do their teaching assignments contribute toward their mastery of the field?

11. Is adequate advisement available for students with regard to employment possibilities and opportunities? Does the record of employment placement of graduates correspond to the educational objectives of the program?

12. Are the facilities, labs and equipment adequate for the purposes of the program? Are the library holdings sufficient in each area in which graduate seminars are offered and in which dissertations are written? Are the facilities and holdings proper for the future plans of the department?

d. Recommendations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academic Program Review in the University of California, Report of the Academic Planning and Program Review Board (Oct., 1976).

Academic Review Policy, San Diego State University, Graduate Division (Unpublished report, January, 1975).

Blackburn, R.T. and P.E. Lingonfelter, Assessing Quality in Doctoral Programs: Criteria and Correlates of Excellence, Unpubl. report for the New York Regent's Commission on Doctoral Education (September, 1972).

Borich, G.D.ed., Evaluating Educational Programs and Products (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1974).

Cartter, A,M,, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966).

Clark, M.J., "The Assessment of Quality in Ph.D. Programs: A Preliminary Report on Judgments by Graduate Dean," (Princton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973).

-----"Dimensions of Quality in Doctoral Education," Findings,1 (1974), 1-4.

-----"The Meaning of Quality in Graduate and Professional Education," in Scholars in the Making, ed. by Joseph Katz and Rodney T. Hartnett (Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976).

-----, R.T. Hartnett, and L.L. Baird, "Assessing Dimensions of Quality in Doctoral Education: A Technical Report of a National Study in Three Fields," (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976).

Cranton, P.A. and L.H. Legge, "Program Evaluation in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, 49 (1978), 464-471.

Dressel, Paul. and M.F. Lorimer, "Institutional Self-Evaluation," in Evaluation in Higher Education, Paul L. Dressel and Associates(Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co, 1961), 392-432.

Guidelines for Consultants' Evaluation Reports, New York State Commission on Higher Education (July, 1974).

Guidelines for Departmental Review by Outside Consultants, University of Missouri-Columbia (March, 1970).

Harf, James E., "Academic Program Review: The Penn State Model," (Unpublished report, 1976).

Policy and Procedure for Review of Graduate Degree Programs, University of Utah Graduate School (January, 1970).

Policy and Procedure for Review of Graduate Programs, Saint Louis University (May, 1976).

Roose, K.D. and C.J. Anderson, A Rating of Graduate Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970).

Scully, Malcolm G., "How to Evaluate Graduate Programs," The Chronicle of Higher Education, XIII,14 (December, 1976).

Shirley, Robert C. and J.F. Volkwein, "Establishing Academic Program Priorities," Journal of Higher Education, 49 (1978), 472-488.

Young, Kenneth E., "Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness," Educational Record, 57 (1976), 45-52.